

Exhibit 9

Jennie Lee Anderson (SBN 203586)
ANDRUS ANDERSON LLP
155 Montgomery Street, Suite 900
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 986-1400
Facsimile: (415) 986-1474
jennie@andrusanderson.com

Counsel for Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

**IN RE: CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT)
ANTITRUST LITIGATION**

Case No. 3:07-cv-5944
MDL No. 1917

CLASS ACTION

This Document Relates to:

All Indirect Purchaser Actions

**DECLARATION OF JENNIE LEE
ANDERSON IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS'
APPLICATION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES,
EXPENSES AND INCENTIVE AWARDS**

Judge: Honorable Samuel Conti
Courtroom One, 17th Floor

1 I, Jennie Lee Anderson, declare as follows:

2 1. I am an attorney licensed to practice in all California courts and a Partner in the law
3 firm Andrus Anderson LLP. I have personal knowledge of the facts stated in this declaration and,
4 if called as a witness, I could and would testify competently to them. I make this declaration in
5 support of my firm's request for attorneys' fees and reimbursement of litigation expenses, as set
6 forth in Plaintiffs' Application for Attorneys' Fees, Expenses and Incentive Awards.

7 2. My firm is counsel of record in this case. A brief description of my firm is attached
8 as Exhibit 1 and incorporated herein by reference.

9 3. Throughout the course of this litigation, my firm kept files contemporaneously
10 documenting all time spent, including tasks performed, and expenses incurred, and transmitted
11 those reports on a regular basis to Lead Counsel. All of the time and expenses reported by my firm
12 were incurred for the benefit of the Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs ("IPPs").

13 4. During the course of this litigation, my firm has been involved in the following
14 tasks and activities on behalf of the IPPs. All of this work was assigned and/or approved by Lead
15 Counsel.

- 16 a. Conducted discovery relating to the five Hitachi Defendants on behalf of the
17 IPPs.
- 18 b. Met and conferred with the Hitachi Defendants regarding dozens of discovery
19 issues, including, but not limited to, deficiencies in discovery responses, search
20 terms, custodian lists, backup tapes, privilege logs and objections, burden
21 objections, deposition protocol, depositions and transactional data.
- 22 c. Prepared for and conducted the lead, direct examination for approximately
23 fifteen (15) depositions, most of which were taken in Japanese with an
24 interpreter.
- 25 d. Prepared for and second chaired and/or conducted secondary examination in
26 approximately four (4) additional depositions.
- 27 e. Briefed and argued multiple motions to compel discovery.

- f. Drafted multiple joint discovery reports for the special master regarding discovery.
- g. Prepared for and handled hearings regarding joint discovery reports.
- h. Drafted Plaintiffs' Opposition to Hitachi Parties' Motion for Summary Judgement Based Upon Lack of Evidence of Participation in the Conspiracy, and prepared evidence in support of the same.
- i. Assisted in the drafting the Hitachi Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment Based Upon Withdrawal and Statute of Limitations.
- j. Assisted in the drafting of the IPP's Opposition to Motions to Dismiss.
- k. Drafted legal memoranda and prepared written materials in preparation for oral argument on motions to dismiss.
- l. Researched approximately 100 document custodians and identified potential deponents.
- m. Drafted multiple rounds of discovery requests.
- n. Drafted deposition notices.
- o. Developed and negotiated search terms.
- p. Drafted and prepared discovery responses on behalf of IPPs.
- q. Worked with experts regarding transactional data produced by defendants.
- r. Participated in the document review, primarily conducting high level analysis and review and/or foreign language document review.
- s. Drafted legal memoranda.
- t. Participated in the evidentiary proffer by a settling defendant.
- u. Supervised multiple teams of document reviewers on special projects, including class certification and deposition projects
- v. Developed litigation strategy with Lead Counsel.
- w. Investigated state law claims.
- x. Coordinated with Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs, Direct Action Plaintiffs and the

1 California Attorney General regarding discovery relating to Hitachi Defendants.

2 y. Enforced multiple third party subpoenas, including, but not limited to, meeting
3 and conferring with BenQ, Sanyo, Sony and Radio Shack regarding the
4 sufficiency of their responses to subpoenas.

5 z. Worked with experts to assess sufficiency of responses to subpoenas.

6 aa. Compiled and analyzed evidence in preparation for trial.

7 5. The schedule attached as Exhibit 2, and incorporated herein, is a detailed summary
8 of the amount of time spent by my firm's partners, attorneys and professional support staff who
9 were involved in this litigation. It does not include any time devoted to preparing this declaration
10 or otherwise pertaining to the Joint Fee Petition. The lodestar calculation is based on my firm's
11 historical billing rates in effect at the time services were performed. Exhibit 2 was prepared from
12 contemporaneous time records regularly prepared and maintained by my firm. Those records have
13 been provided to Lead Counsel and I authorize them to be submitted for inspection by the Court if
14 necessary. The hourly rates for my firm's partners, attorneys and professional support staff
15 included in Exhibit 2 were at the time the work was performed the usual and customary hourly
16 rates charged for their services in similar complex litigation.

17 6. The total number of hours reasonably expended on this litigation by my firm from
18 inception to May 31, 2015 is 5,723.9 hours. The total lodestar for my firm at historical rates is
19 \$2,860,293.50. The total lodestar for my firm at current rates is \$3,097,527.00. Expense items are
20 billed separately and are not duplicated in my firm's lodestar.

21 7. The expenses my firm incurred in litigating this action are reflected in the books
22 and records of my firm. These books and records are prepared from expense vouchers, invoices,
23 receipts, check records and other source materials and accurately reflect the expenses incurred.
24 My firm's expense records are available for inspection by the Court if necessary.

25 8. My firm incurred a total of \$85,702.27 in unreimbursed expenses, all of which were
26 reasonable and necessary for the prosecution of this litigation. Of this amount, \$50,000.00 was for
27 assessment payments for common litigation expenses or direct payments to experts or other
28

1 vendors made at the request of Lead Counsel, and an additional \$35,702.27 was for non-common
2 litigation expenses incurred by my firm, such as travel, meals and lodging, copying, legal research,
3 telephone, etc. A summary of those expenses by category is attached as Exhibit 3.

4 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 31st
5 day of August, 2015, in San Francisco.

6 /s/ Jennie Lee Anderson

7 Jennie Lee Anderson
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT 1

ANDRUS ANDERSON LLP

155 Montgomery Street · Suite 900, San Francisco, California 94104
T: 415.986.1400 · F: 415.986.1474 · www.andrusanderson.com

The Firm

The law firm of Andrus Anderson LLP (“Andrus Anderson”) has a diverse and thriving practice representing plaintiffs in antitrust, consumer protection, employment, personal injury and mass tort cases. Our clients include individuals, classes and small businesses nationwide.

Current Cases and Recent Successes

Andrus Anderson attorneys have considerable class action and complex litigation experience. A few examples of the firm’s recent and ongoing class action and mass tort cases are listed below.

Antitrust

a. *In re Lithium Ion Batteries Antitrust Litigation*, MDL No. 4:13-md-02420 YGR, United States District Court for the Northern District of California. Andrus Anderson partner, Jennie Lee Anderson, is Liaison Counsel for the indirect purchaser plaintiffs. The indirect purchaser plaintiffs allege that the major manufacturers of lithium ion batteries engaged in contract, combination or conspiracy to artificially inflate the prices of lithium ion batteries during the relevant time period.

b. *In re Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) Antitrust Litigation*, MDL No. 1917 SC, United States District Court for the Northern District of California. Andrus Anderson plays a core role as counsel for the indirect purchaser class in this antitrust case against the major manufacturers of CRTs and CRT products, including televisions and monitors. The indirect purchaser plaintiffs allege that defendants engaged in contract, combination or conspiracy to artificially inflate the

prices of CRTs during the relevant time period. Total settlements for the indirect purchaser plaintiffs in the multidistrict litigation total \$563 million. Indirect purchaser plaintiffs' motion for preliminary approval of the settlements is pending.

c. *In re TFT-LCD (Flat Panel) Antitrust Litigation*, MDL No. 07-cv-01827 SI, United States District Court for the Northern District of California. Andrus Anderson played a significant role as class counsel for the indirect purchaser plaintiffs in this antitrust case against the major manufacturers of Thin Film Transistor Liquid Crystal Display panels ("TFT-LCD") and TFT-LCD products, such as flat screen televisions and monitors. The indirect purchaser plaintiffs alleged that defendants engaged in contract, combination or conspiracy to artificially inflate the prices of TFT-LCD panels. Class counsel achieved settlements of more than \$1 billion on behalf of the indirect purchaser classes they represent.

d. *In re Transpacific Passenger Air Transportation Antitrust Litigation*, Case No. 07-cv-5634-CRB, in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. Anderson holds a significant role as class counsel in the case, representing plaintiffs of transpacific airline travel who allege that the defendant airline carriers conspired to fix the prices of air passenger travel including associated surcharges. Settlements of nearly \$50 million have been achieved in the case to date.

e. *Precision Associates, Inc., et al. v. Panalpina World Transportation (Holding) Ltd., et al.*, Case No. 08-cv-00042 (JG) (VVP), United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York. Andrus Anderson represents plaintiffs who purchased freight forwarding services from defendant freight forwarders. Plaintiffs allege that freight forwarders conspired to fix the price of associated surcharges in violation of federal antitrust laws. While the litigation is ongoing, more than \$100 million in settlements have already been approved.

f. *In re Domestic Drywall Antitrust Litigation*, MDL No. 2437, United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. Andrus Anderson and their co-counsel represent indirect purchaser plaintiffs in this case against manufacturers of gypsum drywall. Plaintiffs allege that defendants conspired to raise the price of gypsum drywall in violation of federal and state antitrust laws.

Consumer Protection

g. *Ralston v. Mortgage Investors Group, Inc., Countrywide Home Loans, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 08-00536 JF, United States District Court for the Northern District of California. Andrus Anderson partner, Jennie Lee Anderson, was co-lead counsel in this class action which resulted in an all-cash settlement of more than \$100,000,000 for California borrowers. The lawsuit alleged that Countrywide Home Loans Inc. and Mortgage Investors Group sold certain Pay Option ARM loans, while failing to disclose, among other critical information, the true interest rate on the loan and that negative amortization was certain to occur if the borrower adhered to the payment schedule provided by the defendants.

h. *In re EasySaver Rewards Litigation*, Case No. 09-cv-02094-AJB, United States District Court for the Southern District of California. Andrus Anderson partner, Jennie Lee Anderson, is co-lead counsel in this case representing consumers who were the victims of a so-called “rewards” program, in which consumers were enrolled without their knowledge or consent and then subjected to monthly membership fees, though no benefits were conferred. On February 4, 2013, the court granted final approval of a nationwide settlement valued at over \$38 million.

i. *Milligan v. Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc.*, Case No. 09-05418 RS, United States District Court for the Northern District of California, and *Washington v. Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc.*, Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara, Case No. 1-10-CV-164200.

Andrus Anderson partner, Jennie Lee Anderson, was co-lead class counsel representing a class of 2001-2003 Toyota RAV4 vehicle owners who experienced problems with the engine control modules (“ECMs”) or ECM-related damage to the transmissions. The settlement provided for an extended warranty and full reimbursement for class members who paid out-of-pocket to repair or replace the ECMs and/or transmissions.

j. *Fox v. Nissan North American Inc.*, Case No. GCG-09-490470, San Francisco Superior Court. Andrus Anderson is lead counsel in this lawsuit on behalf of California owners of 2001-2005 Nissan Pathfinders, Altimas and Sentras manufactured with defective power valve screws that are prone to loosen and detach, resulting in engine failure and/or loss of control of the vehicles. Following the Superior Court sustaining a demurrer, Andrus Anderson appealed and, in 2012, the California Court of Appeal reversed and remanded for further proceedings.

k. *Honda/Michelin PAX Tire Litigation*. Andrus Anderson represented consumers in *Olson v. American Honda Motor Company, Inc.*, Case No. RG07341165, Alameda Superior Court; and the following federal cases consolidated into Multidistrict Litigation No. 1911, before Judge Roger Titus in the District of Maryland, where Lori Andrus was appointed Co-Lead Class Counsel (*Williams v. American Honda Motor Co., Inc.*, Case No. 1:07-cv-05933, filed in the Northern District of Illinois; *Palmer v. American Honda Motor Co., Inc.*, Case No. CV07-1904-PHX-DGC, filed in the District of Arizona; *Longo v. American Honda Motor Co., Inc.*, Case No. 07-CIV-9399, filed in the Southern District of New York; and *Smith v. American Honda Motor Co., Inc.*, Case No. 07-61524, filed in the Southern District of Florida). The litigation involved consumers who purchased or leased Honda and Acura vehicles equipped with the PAX[®] Tire and Wheel Assembly System. Plaintiffs alleged that Honda misrepresented and failed to disclose the defective nature of the PAX Systems causing injury to plaintiffs and class members. The firm

achieved a nationwide settlement, wherein class members were reimbursed for premature wear on their tires, received an extended warranty on PAX tires installed on their vehicles for the life of the vehicles, and additional safety features, including the opportunity to obtain a spare tire kit and enhanced emergency service. The litigation was expanded to include owners of certain Nissan vehicles equipped with the PAX Systems and tires.

Employment

l. *Bolton v. U.S. Nursing*, Case No. 12-CV-04466 LB, United States District Court for the Northern District of California. Andrus Anderson and their co-counsel represented temporary nurses in a class case seeking damages for failure to pay on a daily basis, unpaid transportation time and improper meal deductions in violation of the California's labor laws. On October 18, 2013, the district court granted final approval to a class-wide settlement. Andrus Anderson partner, Lori Andrus, was appointed Class Counsel in the case.

m. *Kyriakakos v. Veolia Water North America, Inc.*, Case No. 10-00751, Alameda County Superior Court, State of California. Andrus Anderson represented wastewater and water treatment plant operator, lab technicians and mechanics in this wage and hour suit. Plaintiffs alleged that Veolia failed to pay its workers for all hours worked conducting remote monitoring tasks, time spent donning, doffing, and showering, and that Veolia violated California law with its meal and rest break policies. On October 25, 2013, the court granted final approval of a class-wide settlement. Ms. Andrus was appointed Class Counsel in the matter.

n. *Freeman v. On Assignment Staffing Service, Inc.*, Case No. RG12652237, Alameda County Superior Court, State of California. Andrus Anderson and their co-counsel represented temporary nurses in a class case seeking damages for failure to pay on a daily basis, unpaid transportation time and improper meal deductions in violation of the California's labor laws. On

June 19, 2014, the court granted final approval of a class-wide settlement. Ms. Andrus was appointed Class Counsel in the matter.

o. *Smith v. ServiceMaster Holding Corp., et al.*, Case No. 2:11-cv-02943-JPM-dkv, pending in the United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee. Andrus Anderson represents termite control technicians and pest control technicians in a wage and hour suit against Terminix. Plaintiffs claim that Terminix does not pay for all hours worked or for overtime in violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

p. *Nelson et al., v. California State University, East Bay Foundation, Inc.*, Case No. RG09442869, Alameda County Superior Court, State of California. Andrus Anderson was lead counsel in this wage and hour litigation on behalf of English as a second language (ESL) teachers. In their complaint, current and former ESL teachers alleged that Cal State did not pay them for all hours worked. Andrus Anderson obtained back pay for their clients and negotiated major changes in the practices and policies at California State University, East Bay, to ensure the ESL teachers are fairly compensated going forward.

q. *Adams v. Inter-con Security Systems, Inc.*, Case No. C-06-5428, United States District Court for the Northern District of California. Andrus Anderson and their co-counsel represented security guard employees in a multi-state class action seeking damages for unpaid hours worked off the clock in violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act and several states' labor laws. The lawsuit resulted in a \$4 million settlement for class members who were required to attend daily security briefings and orientation sessions without pay.

Mass Tort

r. *Yaz, Yasmin and Ocella Contraceptive Cases Coordinated Proceeding (JCCP) No. 4608*, pending in Los Angeles County Superior Court, State of California. Andrus Anderson represents

dozens of clients bringing claims against Bayer Corporation, among others, for their injuries resulting from the use of Yaz, Yasmin or Ocella birth control. Ms. Andrus has been appointed to the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee in the case.

a. *In re Ortho Evra Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 1742, United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio. Andrus Anderson represented more than twenty individual clients and was actively involved in the Multi-District Litigation ("MDL") regarding the Ortho Evra birth control patch and women's health problems resulting from the use of the Ortho Evra birth control patch. Andrus Anderson partner Lori Andrus was a member of the MDL Plaintiffs' Steering Committee. The Ortho Evra patch, manufactured by Ortho-McNeil and Johnson & Johnson, has been found to increase the risk of stroke and dangerous blood clots, and has been linked to strokes, heart attacks, and deaths in women.

Partner Biographies

JENNIE LEE ANDERSON

Born in Indianapolis, Indiana, Andrus Anderson partner Jennie Lee Anderson has extensive experience representing plaintiffs in antitrust, consumer protection, employment and personal injury matters. Ms. Anderson has proven herself an effective advocate and has served or serves as liaison or co-lead counsel in multiple state and nationwide class actions including, but not limited to, *In re Lithium Ion Batteries Antitrust Litigation*, *In re EasySaver Rewards Litigation*, *Ralston v. Mortgage Investors Group and Countrywide Home Loans, Inc.*, and *Fox v. Nissan North America, Inc.*, each of which is summarized above.

Ms. Anderson has been recognized as a Northern California Super Lawyer for the last five years, serves on the Board of Governors for the American Association for Justice ("AAJ"),

and is the past chair of the AAJ Class Action Litigation Group, co-chair of the AAJ Antitrust Litigation Group, and immediate past chair of the AAJ Business Torts Section. She is a frequent author and lecturer on a variety of topics regarding class actions and complex litigation.

Ms. Anderson earned her Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Wisconsin-Madison and her Juris Doctor degree from University of California, Hastings College of the Law. In law school, Ms. Anderson served as a judicial extern to the Honorable Martin J. Jenkins, District Court Judge for the Northern District of California, and was a legal intern for Legal Aid of Cambodia in Phnom Penh, Cambodia.

Prior to co-founding Andrus Anderson, Ms. Anderson practiced complex litigation in the San Francisco offices of Lieff, Cabraser, Heimann & Bernstein, LLP and the law firm currently known as Robbins, Geller, Rudman & Dowd, LLP, where she prosecuted multiple class action and complex cases on behalf of plaintiffs in the areas of consumer protection, antitrust, employment, securities and product liability. In addition, Ms. Anderson has considerable knowledge of habeas corpus proceedings, having represented indigent inmates on death row at the Habeas Corpus Resource Center in San Francisco.

LORI ERIN ANDRUS

Born in Lafayette, Louisiana, Andrus Anderson partner Lori E. Andrus is a member of the bars of the California, the District of Columbia, and New York. She is admitted to practice in the United States District Courts for the districts of Northern, Southern, Central and Eastern Districts of California. Ms. Andrus has received Martindale-Hubbell's highest rating (AV) for legal ability and ethical standards.

Ms. Andrus has extensive experience representing consumers and employees in individual and class actions, in addition to her work representing individuals harmed by defective

pharmaceutical and medical devices in mass tort litigation. In recognition of her effective leadership skills, Ms. Andrus currently serves, or has served as lead counsel, co-lead counsel, or as a member of the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee in multiple state and nationwide class actions and multidistrict litigations, including, *Bolton v. U.S. Nursing*, *Kyriakakos v. Veolia Water North America, Inc.*, and *Yaz, Yasmin and Ocella Contraceptive Cases Coordinated Proceeding (JCCP) No. 4608*, each of which is summarized above.

Ms. Andrus previously served as the Chair of the Women Trial Lawyers' Caucus of the American Association for Justice ("AAJ"). She is a frequent author and lecturer on a variety of topics regarding class actions and complex litigation. In 2013, she was recognized as the Woman Consumer Advocate of the Year by the Consumer Attorneys of California.

Ms. Andrus earned her Bachelor of Arts degree from the Boston University, *cum laude*, and graduated from Duke University School of Law with honors. Between college and law school, Ms. Andrus worked for two Members of Congress in Washington, D.C., first for U.S. Representative Rick Boucher from Virginia, then for U.S Representative James Hayes, from Louisiana.

Prior to co-founding Andrus Anderson, Ms. Andrus was a partner at the law firm of Lieff, Cabraser, Heimann & Bernstein, LLP, where she litigated multiple class actions and complex matters in state and federal courts across the country in the areas of mass tort, product liability, loan discrimination, consumer fraud and employment.

EXHIBIT 2

INDIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS

[illegible]

INDIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS

[illegible]

TIME AND LODESTAR SUMMARY

Firm Name	Andrus Anderson LLP		
Reporting Year	2009		

[illegible]

EXHIBIT 2

IN RE CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT) ANTITRUST LITIGATION; MDL NO. 1917

TIME AND LODESTAR SUMMARY

INDIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS

Firm Name	Andrus Anderson LLP		
Reporting Year	2010		

Name/Status	Hourly Rate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Hours	Lodestar
Jennie Anderson (P)	\$ 525.00	5.3	4.2		72.5			22.9	0.6	1.9	43.5			150.9	\$ 79,222.50
Jennifer Marlowe (A)	\$ 390.00									7.8				7.8	\$ 3,042.00
Matthew Chayt (A)	\$ 350.00							6.0						6.0	\$ 2,100.00
Jessica Moy (A)	\$ 330.00				97.9									97.9	\$ 32,307.00
Jaime Pacheco (PL)	\$ 245.00	2.4			2.0			57.0						61.4	\$ 15,043.00
Gian Carlo Sillona (PI)	\$ 170.00	103.3												103.3	\$ 17,561.00
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
		111.0	4.2	0.0	172.4	0.0	0.0	85.9	0.6	9.7	43.5	0.0	0.0	427.3	\$ 149,275.50

TIME AND LODESTAR SUMMARY

Firm Name	Andrus Anderson LLP		
Reporting Year	2011		

[illegible]

TIME AND LODESTAR SUMMARY

Firm Name	Andrus Anderson LLP		
Reporting Year	2012		

[illegible]

TIME AND LODESTAR SUMMARY

Firm Name	Andrus Anderson LLP		
Reporting Year	2013		

[illegible]

IN RE CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT) ANTITRUST LITIGATION; MDL NO. 1917

					TIME AND LODestar SUMMARY									0.0	\$	-
		32.8	2.0	0.0	INDIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS											
					93.4	950.4	145.7	166.2	0.0	38.0	0.2	1.8	0.0	1430.5	\$	758,890.00

EXHIBIT 2

IN RE CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT) ANTITRUST LITIGATION; MDL NO. 1917

TIME AND LODESTAR SUMMARY

INDIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS

Firm Name	Andrus Anderson LLP		
Reporting Year	2014		

Name/Status	Hourly Rate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Hours	Lodestar
Jennie Anderson (P)	\$ 700.00	9.2			60.2	130.1	74.1	115.5	2.7	40.2	253.8	1.0		686.8	\$ 480,760.00
Lori Andrus (P)	\$ 700.00	0.4												0.4	\$ 280.00
Jubilee Menzies (C)	\$ 435.00				27.0	126.0		113.5		42.0	94.0		37.0	439.5	\$ 191,182.50
Masaya Uchino (C)	\$ 425.00									16.5	6.0			22.5	\$ 9,562.50
Leland Belew (A)	\$ 375.00	0.5									12.7			13.2	\$ 4,950.00
Kelli Good (PL)	\$ 285.00	2.3				27.3					59.3			88.9	\$ 25,336.50
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
														0.0	\$ -
		12.4	0.0	0.0	87.2	283.4	74.1	229.0	2.7	98.7	425.8	1.0	37.0	1251.3	\$ 712,071.50

INDIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS

[illegible]

EXHIBIT 2

IN RE CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT) ANTITRUST LITIGATION; MDL NO. 1917

TIME AND LODESTAR SUMMARY

INDIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS

Firm Name	Andrus Anderson LLP		
Reporting Year	Inception through May 31, 2015		

Year		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Hours	Lodestar
2007		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	\$ -
2008		0.8	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	1.5	\$ 337.50
2009		2.6	0.0	0.0	6.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	4.1	14.1	0.0	0.0	28.8	\$ 13,963.50
2010		111.0	4.2	0.0	172.4	0.0	0.0	85.9	0.6	9.7	43.5	0.0	0.0	427.3	\$ 149,275.50
2011		9.8	22.3	0.0	341.5	0.0	0.0	352.3	0.0	0.8	37.9	0.2	0.0	764.8	\$ 296,509.00
2012		27.8	21.0	0.0	161.2	535.0	79.1	662.2	18.5	2.7	221.3	0.0	0.0	1728.8	\$ 876,343.00
2013		32.8	2.0	0.0	93.4	950.4	145.7	166.2	0.0	38.0	0.2	1.8	0.0	1430.5	\$ 758,890.00
2014		12.4	0.0	0.0	87.2	283.4	74.1	229.0	2.7	98.7	425.8	1.0	37.0	1251.3	\$ 712,071.50
2015		3.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.3	0.0	1.1	0.3	0.0	70.3	90.9	\$ 52,903.50
		201.1	49.5	0.0	862.7	1768.8	298.9	1510.9	23.0	155.1	743.6	3.0	107.3	5723.9	\$ 2,860,293.50

STATUS:

(P) Partner
 (OC) Of Counsel
 (A) Associate
 (LC) Law Clerk
 (PL) Paralegal
 (PI) Paralegal Intern
 (I) Investigator

CATEGORIES:

1 Attorney Meeting/Strategy
 2 Court Appearance
 3 Client Meeting
 4 Draft Discovery Requests or Responses
 5 Deposition Preparation
 6 Attend Deposition - Conduct/Defend
 7 Document Review
 8 Experts - Work or Consult
 9 Research
 10 Motions/Pleadings
 11 Settlement
 12 Trial

EXHIBIT 3

EXHIBIT 3

IN RE CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT) ANTITRUST LITIGATION; MDL NO. 1917

EXPENSE SUMMARY

INDIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS

Firm Name	Andrus Anderson LLP
Reporting Year	Inception through May 31, 2015

TYPE OF EXPENSE		TOTAL
Assessments		\$ 50,000.00
Outside Copies		\$ -
In-house Reproduction/Copies		\$ 25,855.80
Court Costs & Filing Fees		\$ -
Court Reporters & Transcripts		\$ -
Computer Research		\$ 1,343.48
Telephone & Facsimile		\$ 309.58
Postage/Express Delivery/Courier		\$ 728.56
Professional Fees (investigator, accountant, etc.)		\$ -
Experts		\$ -
Witness / Service Fees		\$ -
Travel: Airfare		\$ 3,101.61
Travel: Lodging/Meals		\$ 2,493.26
Travel: Other		\$ -
Car Rental/Cabfare/Parking		\$ 1,350.91
Other Expenses		\$ 519.07
		\$ 85,702.27